

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 CLIFTON WALKER,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 SCOTT EVAN POWELL, et al.,

14 Defendants.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

No. 2:23-cv-06142-JAK (KSx)

**ORDER RE TO SHOW CAUSE RE:  
SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION  
OVER STATE-LAW CLAIMS**

1 Based on a review of the Complaint (Dkt. 1), the following determinations are  
2 made:

3 The Complaint alleges violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42  
4 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq. (the “ADA”), the Unruh Civil Rights Act (the “Unruh Act”),  
5 Cal. Civ. Code §§ 51-53, and other provisions of California law. Supplemental  
6 jurisdiction is the basis for the state-law claims. Dkt. 1 ¶ 7.

7 District courts may exercise “supplemental jurisdiction over all other claims that  
8 are so related to claims in the action within such original jurisdiction that they form part  
9 of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.” 28  
10 U.S.C. § 1367(a). This “is a doctrine of discretion, not of plaintiff’s right.” *United Mine*  
11 *Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715, 726 (1966). “In order to decide whether to exercise  
12 jurisdiction over pendent state law claims, a district court should consider . . . at every  
13 stage of the litigation, the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and  
14 comity.” *Nishimoto v. Federman-Bachrach & Assocs.*, 903 F.2d 709, 715 (9th Cir. 1990)  
15 (citation omitted).

16 In 2012, California imposed heightened pleading requirements for Unruh Act  
17 claims. Cal. Civ. Code § 55.52(a)(1); Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 425.50(a). In 2015,  
18 California also imposed a “high-frequency litigant fee” for plaintiffs and law firms that  
19 have brought large numbers of construction-related accessibility claims. Cal. Gov’t Code  
20 70616.5. As detailed in previous orders by this Court and other district courts in  
21 California, these reforms addressed the small number of plaintiffs and counsel who bring  
22 a significant percentage of construction-related accessibility claims. *E.g.*, *Whitaker v.*  
23 *RCP Belmont Shore LLC*, No. LA CV19-09561 JAK (JEMx), 2020 WL 3800449, at \*6-  
24 8 (Mar. 30, 2020); *Garibay v. Rodriguez*, No. 2:18-cv-09187-PA (AFMx), 2019 WL  
25 5204294, at \*1-6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2019). These statutes impose special requirements  
26 for construction-related accessibility claims brought by high-frequency plaintiffs  
27 pursuant to the Unruh Act. Because accepting supplemental jurisdiction over such claims  
28

1 would permit high-frequency plaintiffs to side-step those state-law requirements by  
2 pursuing the claims in a federal forum, many district courts, including this one, have  
3 declined to exercise such jurisdiction. *E.g.*, *Whitaker*, 2020 WL 3800449, at \*6-8;  
4 *Garibay*, 2019 WL 5204294, at \*1-6.

5 A review of the docket in this District shows that, in the one-year period preceding  
6 the filing of the Complaint, Plaintiff has filed more than ten actions in which he has  
7 advanced construction-related accessibility claims. In addition, Plaintiff's counsel, Jason  
8 Kim, Jason Yoon, and Kevin Hong of the So Cal Equal Access Group, has represented  
9 several individuals who appear to be high-frequency plaintiffs in construction-related  
10 accessibility actions. In a California Superior Court, Plaintiff would be deemed a high-  
11 frequency litigant. If so, "California's recent legislative enactments confirm that the state  
12 [would have] a substantial interest in this case." *Perri v. Thrifty Payless*, No. 2:19-CV-  
13 07829-CJC (SKx), 2019 WL 7882068, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 8, 2019).

14 In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff is **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why the  
15 Court should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims.  
16 Plaintiff shall file a response to this Order to Show Cause, not to exceed ten pages, on or  
17 before August 14, 2023. In responding to this Order to Show Cause, Plaintiff shall  
18 identify the amount of statutory damages Plaintiff seeks to recover. Plaintiff shall also  
19 present a declaration, signed under penalty of perjury, providing the evidence necessary  
20 for the Court to determine if Plaintiff meets the definition of a "high-frequency litigant"  
21 as defined in Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 425.50(b)(1) & (2). Failure to file a timely response  
22 to this Order to Show Cause may result in the dismissal of the state-law claims without  
23 prejudice by declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over them, pursuant to 28  
24 U.S.C. § 1367(c). Defendant may also file a response to this Order to Show Cause, not to  
25 exceed ten pages, on or before August 28, 2023. Upon receipt of the response(s), the  
26 matter will be taken under submission, and a written order will issue.

1  
2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3  
4 Dated: August 1, 2023



5 John A. Kronstadt

6 United States District Judge  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28